

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14, 16-24, and 27-56 remain in this application. Claims 1, 30, and 51 have been amended. Claims 15, 25-26 have been previously canceled. No new claims have been added. Claims 57-131 have been withdrawn as a result of an earlier restriction requirement. In view of the Examiner's earlier restriction requirement, Applicants retain the right to present Claims 57-131 in a divisional application.

1. Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b or e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b or e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ishiguro et al (5,022,904), Yokoyama et al (6,535,679), Schneider et al (4,557,561), Hicks (4,579,571) or Ishikawa et al (5,895,515).

Respectfully, the rejection is flawed and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner asserts that Ishiguro et al shows a process for doping a soot preform with fluorine (F) and indicates that since the pressure is less in the second heating step, that there must have been an "inherent" evacuation. Respectfully, Examiner has not given the term "pulse" a meaning consistent with the present specification.

"Pulse," as used herein, and as now clarified in the claims, means that a flow of the doping atmosphere into the vessel is interrupted such that flow through the vessel is fully or substantially reduced during the reacting time. See Para [0053] for support. No such "pulsing" followed by "partial evacuation" is taught or suggested by Ishiguro et al. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1 and 51 should be withdrawn.

None of the other cited references (Yokoyama et al , Schneider et al, Hicks, or Ishikawa et al) teach pulsed doping as contemplated herein.

2. Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3-14, 16-24, 27-50, and 52-56 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishiguro et al (5,022,904), Yokoyama et al (6,535,679), Schneider et al (4,557,561), Hicks (4,579,571) or Ishikawa et al (5,895,515).

As described above, none of the cited references teach or suggest "pulsed" doping as contemplated by the claims herein, now clarified. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 3-14, 16-24, 27-50, and 52-56 should also be withdrawn. Examiner should note that the present invention "pulsed" method provides significant advantages relative to the prior

Appl. No.: 10/053,365
Amdt. Dated: February 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of: November 23, 2004

art flow-through methods in terms of lower amounts of gases used, doping and drying effectiveness, and lower affluent production.

3. Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, Applicants believe the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants believe that no extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should Applicants be in error, Applicants respectfully request that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorize the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Randall S. Wayland at 607-974-0463.

Respectfully submitted,



Randall S. Wayland
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 36,303
Corning Incorporated
SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831
607-974-0463

DATE: 2-23-05